REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3, 13, and 22 have been amended. Claim 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to provide that the printer has a nozzle orifice of between 200 and 500 μm. Support for this amendment is found in the published application at paragraph [0031]. No new matter has been added.

IDS

An Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith, including the International Preliminary Examination Report, the International Search Report, the references cited therein (or their US equivalents), and a reference described in the application. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the references cited therein.

Discussion of Rejections

A. Anticipation Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 13, 14, 17-19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hale.

Claim 1 has been amended to provide that the ink jet printer has a nozzle orifice of between 200 and 500 μm. Hale does not disclose a nozzle orifice diameter. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 19, and 21 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 has also been amended to provide that the ink jet printer has a nozzle orifice of between 200 and 500 μm. Hale does not disclose a nozzle orifice diameter. Therefore, claim 13 is not anticipated. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 13, 14, 17, and 18 be withdrawn.

B. Obviousness Rejections

Claims 3-5, 8, 10-12 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Hale in view of Endo. Claims 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a), as unpatentable over Hale in view of Clemens. Claims 1, 13, and 22 has been amended to provide that the ink jet printer has a nozzle orifice of between 200 and 500 µm. Endo does not teach a nozzle orifice of between 200 and 500 µm. Endo discloses a bubble jet printer, wherein thermal energy is used to form bubbles in the ink. See column 3, lines 40-47. The largest orifice diameter disclosed in Endo is 100 micron, with 50-60 micron being typically used. See col. 13, line 67 to col. 14, line 4; Table 2, 4, and 6. In contrast, the present application is directed to drop-on-demand printer that, in one embodiment, uses solenoid valves to control the flow of ink, which uses larger orifice diameters. See paragraph [0034]. Since the drop-on-demand printer uses valves instead of thermal ink jet, it uses larger orifice diameters than those disclosed in Endo.

The Examiner notes in the rejection that the application mentions the commercial availability of a drop-on-demand printer that operates at 3 to 5 bar using nozzle orifices of 200 to 500 microns. However, the application does not disclose that such drop-on-demand printers were ever previously used with the claimed printing method. Further, Applicants note that the application specifically mentions the well-known difficulties in using ink jet printers for highly pigmented or highly viscous materials. See paragraph [0008] of the published application. Thus, it would not be obvious to use such a printer for printing an image to form a transfer. There is no indication that the prior art teaches or suggests the use of such drop-on-demand printers for manufacturing a transfer for application to a substrate, including the steps of applying an image to a carrier sheet; and applying a cover coat over to form a transfer, as provided in claim 1. Therefore, the pending claims are not obvious. Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph A. Yosick/

Joseph A. Yosick., Reg. No. 51,062
Videojet Technologies Inc.
1500 N. Mittel Blvd.
Wood Dale, IL 60191
(630) 694-2592 (telephone)
(630) 616-2490 (facsimile)

Date: January 26, 2010